

### **REMARKS**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-7, were rejected. Claim 2 was rejected under §112, first paragraph, for reciting a single means claim. Claims 3-7 were rejected under §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for recitations of language that lack clarity, are vague and indefinite, or lack antecedent basis. Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under §102(b) over Gans. Claim 2 was rejected under §102(e) over Borland. And, objection was made to claims 4-7 for informalities recited in claims 4 and 6. Additionally, the Examiner indicated claims 4-7 to recite allowable subject matter.

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter of claims 4-7. Amendments to claims 4, 5, 6, and 7 are made to overcome the §112 rejections thereof and to correct for the informalities to which objection was made.

Additionally, independent claims 1, 2, and 3 have been amended in manners set forth herein both to overcome the §112 rejection of claims 2 and 3 and to distinguish better the invention of the present application over the cited references used, respectively, there against.

With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended now to recite a signal folder that rearranges a time-compressed representation of a binary signal by positioning real-valued parts of the symbols adjacent to one another and imaginary-valued parts of the symbols adjacent to one another. And, the recitation of the envelope shaper has been amended now to recite that the envelope shaper forms an envelope-shaped signal by modulating indications of selected real-valued parts onto an in-phase carrier and by modulating indications of selected imaginary valued parts onto a quadrature-phase carrier.

Support for the amendments can be found, for instance, in paragraphs 27, 36, 38, 40, and 41.

As now-amended, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable over Gans. For instance, Gans fails to disclose the signal folder as now recited and Gans fails to disclose the envelope

shaper as now-recited.

Claim 2 has also been amended, now to recite an apparatus having a phase extractor, a magnitude determiner, and a zero padder. Support for the amendments can be found, for instance, in paragraphs 48 and 49 of the specification.


As now-amended, claim 2 is believed to be distinguishable over Borland. Borland fails to disclose neither the phase extractor, the magnitude determiner, nor the zero padder, as now recited.

Claim 3 has also been amended, now to recite a transmitter having a signal folder and envelope shaper. The recitations of the signal folder and the envelope shaper of the transmitter correspond to the recitation set forth in amended claim 1. Claim 3 is believed to be patentably distinguishable over Gans for the same reason as that set forth with respect to amended claim 1.

Accordingly, as now-amended, claims 4-7, previously indicated to recite patentable subject matter, and claims 1, 2, and 3, as now-amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 18 Oct 04

  
Robert H. Kelly, Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.  
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
Telephone: (214) 706-4200  
Fax: (214) 706-4242  
[robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com](mailto:robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com)